



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2022

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/22/3290300

22 Bescar Lane, Ollerton, Newark, Nottinghamshire NG22 9BS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R Nuttall against the decision of Newark and Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02188/HOUSE, dated 6 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of garage to bedroom; removal of a covered area and the construction of an orangery and ensuite; small single storey extension to front elevation to form utility room; small 2-storey extension to the rear elevation to form dining area with ensuite over.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern detached dwelling with traditional features that addresses Bescar Road along which properties vary in size, age and design. Consequently, there is some variety to the general appearance of existing development within the local street scene to which No 22 belongs.
4. The front elevation of the appeal dwelling facing the road is relatively wide compared to its modest depth into the plot. Each of the front and rear elevations has an off-centre 2-storey gable, staggered build lines and a varied roofscape, all of which give the house an individual character.
5. The site lies within the Ollerton Conservation Area (CA), which is predominantly residential in character. From what I saw, the CA has a variety of properties within it with no obvious style or pattern of development prevailing. While No 22 has no significant architectural or historic merit, it does add to the overall suburban feel along Bescar Lane, which is a characteristic of the CA.
6. My attention has been drawn to a recently published draft appraisal of the CA. According to the appellant, the draft CA appraisal refers to the modern houses along Bescar Lane as an area that it considers have no or little heritage value. The appellant also states that the draft CA appraisal refers to pockets of 20th Century bungalows and detached hipped roof houses where the style, form,

scale and arrangement of the properties do not relate to the character and appearance of the CA. While I have taken this evidence into account, the draft CA appraisal appears to be at an early stage in preparation and its content may change prior to approval. As a result, I attach no more than limited weight to it for the purpose of this appeal.

7. The proposal is to enlarge No 22 with 2-storey and single storey extensions to the rear and side of the dwelling and a single storey addition at the front. While the appellant considers that each element of the appeal scheme would be modest in size and subservient to the existing dwelling, the combined effect on the size, form and appearance of the host building would be considerable.
8. Specifically, the proposed extensions would elongate the host building, significantly enlarge its footprint and noticeably add to its scale and mass particularly at the rear. By extending across almost the full width of the main house at ground floor level and projecting outwards from the existing main wall, the proposal would largely mask the lower part of the existing dwelling and visually dominate its rear elevation.
9. With 2 rear projecting gables side-by-side, each significant in scale and height at one end of the dwelling, there would be an awkward imbalance to the upper rear elevation of the finished building. That imbalance would be exacerbated by the introduction of the ground floor extension towards the other side of the building that, due to its considerable width and flat roof, would appear as a large box-like addition. To my mind, the visually strong horizontal lines established by the ground floor addition, accentuated by the line of full-length windows, a long glass lantern roof light and the flat roof, would conflict unsatisfactorily with the vertical emphasis of the repetitive gable features.
10. As a result, the rear elevation of the finished building would be ill proportioned and uneasy on the eye, which would be evident from the back garden of No 22 and some nearby properties. For these reasons, the new rear and side extensions would unduly compromise and therefore harm the intrinsic character of the host building even taking into account its individualistic style. In doing so, the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the CA, which would fail to be preserved or enhanced.
11. In reaching this conclusion, I have taken into account the proposed use of matching external materials. I also acknowledge that views of the new rear and side additions from public vantage points would be limited given their position towards and at the back of the main house. However, these elements of the appeal scheme would be visible from properties adjacent to the site. In any event, the requirement for development proposals to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA applies with equal force whether or not the proposal is prominent or available to public view.
12. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, such as a conservation area, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The harm to the CA would be less than substantial in this case. In those circumstances, the Framework states that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits. No such benefits have been put forward and none would outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

13. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Accordingly, it is contrary to Core Policies 9 and 14 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy and Policies DM5, DM6 and DM9 of the Newark and Sherwood Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document. These policies seek to ensure that development is appropriate in scale and form; respects the design of the host dwelling and the character of the surrounding area; and protects or enhances any heritage assets.
14. There would also be a conflict with the statutory duty, which requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, which I have done. The proposal would also be at odds with policies of the Framework, which state that new development should be sympathetic to local character; add to the overall quality of the area; and protect heritage assets.
15. Reference is made to a recent appeal decision at Egmanton, Newark, which is within the same local authority area as the site. From the limited information provided, I am not persuaded that the circumstances in that appeal are the same or very similar to those of the proposal. As there are few direct parallels to be drawn between these cases, I attach only limited weight to it in support of the appellant's case. In any event, each development should be assessed on its own merits, as I have done in this instance.
16. The Council raises no objection to the proposed front extension. I, too, find this element of the appeal scheme acceptable because it would be modest in scale, height, and depth, and appropriate in design and general appearance. It would respect the visual character of the existing property and the local area. From my inspection of the plans, this part of the appeal scheme is not clearly severable to the rear and side extensions, which are objectionable. As such, I am unable to issue a split decision that grants planning permission solely for it.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account the support of the Town Council, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR